

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,298	10/28/2003	Toshiyuki Baba	42479-8100	4183
	7590 · 02/22/2007 MER LLP (OC)	EXAMINER		
600 ANTON B		WATTS, ALLISON LEIGH		
SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·	-,	1753		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		02/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

/	
0	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
065 - 4 - 4' - 11 0 - 11 - 1	10/695,298	BABA, TOSHIYUKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Allison L. Watts	1753			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Ja	nuary 2003.				
	action is non-final.				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
· ——	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or example.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298

Art Unit: 1753

## Page 2

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-3, drawn to a method of making, classified in class 65, subclass
     153.
  - II. Claim 4, drawn to a method of making, classified in class 65, subclass153.
  - III. Claims 5-11, drawn to a product, classified in class 204, subclass 416.
- 2. Inventions Group I and Group II are directed to related processes of making. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the method of Group I as claimed could be used to make a different product other than the ion measuring device as described in Group II. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 3. Inventions Group I and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298

Art Unit: 1753

different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product of Group III could be made using a different method other than the welding method as described in Group I. Also, the method of Group I could be used to make a materially different product other than the ion measuring device as described in Group III.

Page 3

- 4. Inventions Group II and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product of Group III could be made using a different method other than the welding method as described in Group II.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298

Art Unit: 1753

recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. A telephone call was made to Joseph Price on 2/6/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allison L. Watts whose telephone number is (571) 272-6640. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298 Page 5

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALW 2/9/2007

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700